

PROCUREMENT POLICES AND REGULATIONS TASK FORCE

MEETING MINUTES

July 16, 2015 – 4:00 p.m.

5th Floor Council Conference Room, Council Office Building

Members Present

Wayne Cobb
Tom Creamer
Eppie Hankins
Linda Moore
David Robbins, Chair

Members Absent

Buddy Henley
Daniel Parra

County Staff Present:

Richard Melnick, Office of the County Attorney
Linda Price, County Council
Mary Anne Paradise, County Council

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. with a quorum of members present. The minutes of the July 2, 2015, meeting were unanimously approved by all Task Force members present.

II. Worksession – Recommendation Development

Members presented their initial recommendations and ideas for inclusion in the report:

- Mr. Creamer suggested raising the procurement dollar thresholds to reduce the amount of paperwork for procurement staff; too much paperwork is required of bidders prior to consideration.
- Mr. Cobb said the County in general has a posture of risk aversion – too much work up front with no follow through at the back end of the procurement process; decentralize the process to allow for more decision making; not enough automation; reduce/eliminate paper.
- Ms. Moore indicated she saw little “fire in the belly” from procurement staff; establish an easier navigation process, both internal and external to make it more user friendly; noted a need for metrics to describe success in procurement process; need a moratorium on new requirements – get resources to support small businesses; suggested getting information on best practices from outside organizations. She questioned the amount spent (\$227 million) on direct County purchases; suggested setting a pool so small businesses have a better chance at success.
- Mr. Robbins offered his suggestions, as reflected in his email of July 15.
- Mr. Melnick commented on recent legislation that highlights tension on the procurement system; overlay of preferences creates confusion – policy makers have tried to make improvements but makes the system more cumbersome. He noted the lack of a boiler plate scope of work for contracts (developed on a case-by-case basis) – suggested more legal staff is needed to deal with the procurement process and meet turnaround times.

- Ms. Price suggested transparency improvements are needed, the procurement website should be more appealing and educational, and noted staffing issues.
- Mr. Robbins noted Ms. Jones' comment that there is no formalized training for procurement staff.
- Mr. Henley emailed his comments: regulations are broad and don't fit specific industries; there is a disconnect between the using branch and the executive branch; and he supported the front-end vetting of vendors and expressed the view that the prevailing wage system is broken.

The members of the Task Force had no objections to any of the above findings.

III. Reconciliation and Report Development

Task Force members generally agreed on the following format for the report:

- | | |
|------|---|
| I. | Introduction |
| | A. Why Are We Here/Mission Statement/Resolution |
| | B. What Was Our Process |
| | C. What We Learned |
| | i. Internal – Meetings |
| | ii. Vendors – Surveys |
| | iii. Our Analysis |
| II. | Recommendations |
| | A. Short term |
| | B. Medium Term |
| | C. Long Term |
| III. | County Reaction |
| IV. | Vendor Reaction |
| V. | Conclusion |

- Short term recommendations will generally be low money, low time requirements; medium term recommendations are mid-range; long term recommendations would be longer time, higher dollar solutions.

Mr. Robbins requested members to put their detailed recommendations in an email to Linda Price so they can be discussed amongst the group. An outline with bullets is acceptable, but it would be better to be as detailed now as possible. This is due by July 27.

Ms. Moore volunteered to draft the vendor survey section; Ms. Price will complete the why are we here and process sections; Mr. Cobb will draft the internal meetings section; and Ms. Hankins and Mr. Creamer will draft the recommendations section. Initial drafts of the written sections are due at the August 13 meeting.

The next meeting is July 30, 2015.

The meeting adjourned at 5:11 p.m.
